

REMARKS

The present application was filed on September 29, 2003 with claims 1 through 20. Claims 1 through 20 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 11, 16, 17, and 19 are proposed to be amended herein.

5 In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Garrity et al. (United States Patent Number 6,230,205), rejected claims 1, 2, 8, 9, and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Raz (United States Patent Number 6,292,827), rejected claims 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mitchelmore (United States Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0090934),  
10 and rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchelmore, and further in view of Raz (United States Patent Number 6,952,578). Applicants note that the inventors of United States Patent Number 6,952,578 are Pedersen et al. and assume the Examiner meant to cite United States Patent Number 6,292,827 as in the previous rejection.

The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors

15 Independent Claims 1, 10 and 16

Independent claims 1 and 16 were rejected 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Garrity et al., independent claims 1 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Raz, and independent claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mitchelmore. Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Garrity teaches wherein  
20 said application layer broker provides an indirect coupling between said at least one application server and said one or more wireless communication devices (col. 6, lines 4-26; col. 7, lines 9-65; col. 12, line 48, to col. 14, line 15; and FIGS. 1, 4, 9, and 10), and asserts that Raz teaches wherein said application layer broker provides an indirect coupling between said at least one application server and said one or more wireless communication devices (col. 3, lines 27-57; col. 4, lines 7-13;  
25 col. 8, lines 22-65; col. 11, lines 23-64; and FIGS. 1, 10, and 11).

Applicants note that independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended to require an event-triggered content delivery mechanism, wherein said event-triggered content delivery mechanism receives requests to transfer said content, transfers said content from said application server to said application layer broker, and *generates an event notification* to at least one of said  
30 wireless communication devices, wherein said event notification provides said indirect coupling

*and includes linkage information to allow said at least one of said wireless communication devices to access said content from said application layer broker.* Independent claim 16 has also been amended to require *generating an event notification* to said wireless device, *wherein said event notification provides said indirect coupling and includes linkage information to allow said wireless device to access said content from said application layer broker.* Support for this amendment can be found, for example, on page 4, lines 8-11, and page 9, lines 8-24, of the originally filed disclosure. Applicants note that none of the cited references disclose or suggest generating an event notification to a wireless device, wherein the *event notification* provides an *indirect coupling* and includes *linkage information* to allow the wireless device to access the content from the application layer broker.

Thus Garrity et al., Raz, and Mitchelmore, alone or in any combination, do not disclose or suggest an event-triggered content delivery mechanism, wherein said event-triggered content delivery mechanism receives requests to transfer said content, transfers said content from said application server to said application layer broker, and generates an event notification to at least one of said wireless communication devices, wherein said event notification provides said indirect coupling and includes linkage information to allow said at least one of said wireless communication devices to access said content from said application layer broker, as required by independent claims 1 and 10, as amended, and do not disclose or suggest generating an event notification to said wireless device, wherein said event notification provides said indirect coupling and includes linkage information to allow said wireless device to access said content from said application layer broker, as required by independent claim 16, as amended.

#### Dependent Claims 2-9, 11-15 and 17-20

Dependent claims 3, 4, 6-9, and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Garrity et al., claims 2, 8, 9, and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Raz, claims 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mitchelmore, and claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchelmore, and further in view of Raz.

Claims 2-9, 11-15, and 17-20 are dependent on claims 1, 10, and 16, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Garrity et al., Raz, and Mitchelmore (alone or in any combination) because of their dependency from amended independent claims 1, 10, and 16 for the

reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1 through 20, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited

5 If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

10



Date: August 29, 2007

Kevin M. Mason  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg No 36,597  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
1300 Post Road, Suite 205  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 255-6560

15